IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 979

International Court of Justice

H0979-0002

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

25 June 1946

COMMISSIONER:

Captain Joseph Tubridy

THE O. K. W.

(THE COMMISSION CONVENED AT 1000 HOURS.)

GENERAL HANS RHINEHARDT, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY DR. LATERNSER

Q Witness, I want to ask you one more question concerning the Affidavit No. 14 which was presented yesterday by the Prosecution, an affidavit signed by the General of the Police, von dem Bach-Zelewski. I quote from the top of page 3. He says: "It is without a question that both the Army formations and the formations of the SS and Police went far over their goal with these counter measures. In the general discussions which Schenkendorff carried out, this fact was found to be true time and time again." I would like you to tell me what you did or what you ordered if you found out that in anti-partisan warfare some of your troops went over the ordered measures or beyond the ordered measures.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Excuse me a minute. I would like to hear again what was quoted from the affidavit.

(Court reporter read the quotation from the affidavit.)

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: All right.

H0979 - 0003

A When soldiers were responsible for measures that were not ordered during these anti-partisan activities, then I had them disciplined severely. I do not know what happened in the areas of General Schenckendorff or General von dem Bach.

Q Can you give us a special example as to how you acted against any kind of excessive measures by your troops against the partisans?

A I do not remember any specific examples from memory but the Court Martial records of the army could tell you about them.

Q On page 4 of the affidavit No. 14, General von dem Bach-Zelewski states as follows and I quote: "During the fall of 1943 virtually the entire border between the Army Group North and Army Group Center was occupied by a strongly led partisan unit. On my partisan map I designated this area as a partisan republic. Both the Army Leader of the Vitebsk Area, that is General Rhinehardt, as well as I, reported these dangers in memoranda. These memoranda were exchanged between the Commando Staff Reichsfuehrer-SS and the O.K.H." General, I want to ask you whether you too sent a memorandum to the Reichsfuehrer-SS?

A Without a doubt you are speaking here of the partisan area south of Polotzk, which I already talked about. I pointed out the dangers of this partisan group several times in memoranda to higher headquarters and asked for reserves in order to combat these men. However, my memoranda went only to General Field Marshal von Kluge, my superior officer. I never reported it to the Reichsfuehrer-SS.

Q The Prosecution also presented yesterday Affidavit No. 24, USA 565 of Colonel Polin, and I quote from this statement: "I was at the beginning of the war, First General Staff Officer of the 17th Armored Division." I skip a few sentences wherein the person who wrote this affidavit, that is, Colonel Polin, talks about the Commissar Order, and now I quote again: "This Decree

H0979-0004

was for all formations of the Eastern Armies." I would like to ask you now, according to your military knowledge, whether a First General Staff Officer of an Armored Division can give this kind of far-reaching information, that is, information that the Commissar Decree was meant for all formations of the Eastern Armies?

A In itself, a First General Staff Officer of a Division cannot judge a matter like that. However, it is possible that the distribution on this Decree was marked to all formations or all units.

Q In other words, he could have seen from the distribution that this Decree was being distributed and where it was being distributed. Did he, as First General Staff Officer of a Division, have the possibility to see whether or not this order was carried out on the entire front?

A No, he did not have that possibility and the best proof of this is that the Decree was not passed on to all army formations and therefore he did judge wrong.

Q Was a division on the front informed of the position of the neighboring divisions?

A No, just the opposite. We only found out what was absolutely necessary for our district, on order of the Fuehrer himself, in order to keep it secret.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean you did not know what divisions were on your right and on your left?

WITNESS: That we knew but we did not know their intentions or their duties.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean you did not know the plans of the divisions on the right and left?

WITNESS: I knew the plans of my division, yes.

H0979-0005

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: But you did not know the plans of the divisions on your right and left?

WITNESS: No, I was not informed in detail of the plans of the neighboring divisions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You were not asked whether you were informed in detail. You were asked whether you knew?

WITNESS: Not always.

DR. LATERNSER: I would ask for orientation concerning the knowledge of one division about the plans and intentions of neighboring divisions from the standpoint of the one division.

WITNESS: The division did not have any information concerning this.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I think the witness is testifying to general affairs. The general question is whether a General Staff Officer of one division would know the plans and operations of divisions on either side. If the witness is testifying to a general practice he should not be talking about his own division.

DR. LATERNSER: I am finished with the questioning on this chapter.

BY DR. LATERNSER:

Q You answered yesterday, to a question of Dr. Kempner, that you were put in charge of the provisional staff that was to prepare for a landing in England. What did this staff think of the possibilities of a landing like that?

A The action was, in our eyes, extremely difficult. I considered the possibility of success as being very small.

Q Did you let your superiors know of your opinion?

A This opinion of mine was stated to General von Brauchitsch in detail during an inspection of his at Antwerp.

Q And what was his point of view?

A He agreed with my opinion.

H0979-0006

Q Q Yesterday, during cross-examination, you were questioned concerning the order that General von Reichenau had issued to his troops concerning treatment of civilian population. Did you receive that order?

A Yes, I received that order.

Q Did you pass it on?

A No, I did not pass it on.

Q Was your relation to the civilian population changed after receiving ~~gx~~ this order?

A No.

Q Yesterday there was also talk concerning the orders, according to which no prisoners were to be taken in the East. Can you remember that you ever received any such Decree or Directive?

A No.

Q When and where did you hear concerning these directives?

A I only heard of them here in Nurnberg, while studying the files.

Q In the sector which was under your command as Commander-in-Chief, was any action taken according to an order like that?

A No.

Q In your territory were many prisoners taken?

A We took a great many prisoners.

Q Yesterday you were also shown a letter, by Rosenberg, dated 28 February 1942, in which it stated that half-starving Russian prisoners were being shot. Do you know of any orders or decrees which were given out by any office at any time, according to which half starved prisoners were to be shot?

A No.

Q Did you, during your advance, find reasons to believe that the

H0979 - 0007

enemies were shooting German prisoners?

A Several times.

Q You were also asked by the Russian Prosecutor, Colonel Pokrovsky, about an order, according to which the Germans, during the winter of 1941, took the felt shoes from the Russian prisoners of war. You stated to the questioning of Colonel Pokrovsky that you considered this order a military necessity. For what reason?

A This is an order which lower commanders gave. We took the felt shoes away in order to guard our own men against frost-bite because we had a large number of casualties through freezing. We had to keep our soldiers able to fight.

Q Did these Russian soldiers have other shoes besides the felt shoes that you took away from them?

A First of all, the Russians had another pair of shoes with them and in addition to that they received the shoes which our soldiers took off.

DR. PELCKMANN: I have no further questions.

DR. KEMPNER: I would like to be allowed to ask about a few things which came up right now.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

BY DR. KEMPNER:

Q You stated here that you studied the files. What files did you study?

A The files of the prosecution.

Q What did they contain -- what were they?

A The indictments of the various prosecutors and the files that were connected with them.

Q With whom did you study them?

A I read them by myself.

H0979-0008

Q With whom did you speak concerning this entire complex within the last three to four weeks? I do not mean Dr. Laternser.

A With some Generals with whom I am living over there.

Q Von Rundstedt?

A Not in detail with General von Rundstedt.

Q But in general?

A No, I hardly spoke with General von Rundstedt concerning this question.

Q What do you mean by "hardly?"

A I did not speak to General von Rundstedt at all concerning this question.

Q Within the last two minutes you have made three different statements - you "hardly" spoke with him about it, you "did not speak at all" with him about it and you said something else. Now what am I supposed to believe?

A I did not speak with General von Rundstedt concerning the individual single indictment files.

Q Did you speak with him after he was questioned here?

A Not concerning these files.

Q You know very well that I do not mean concerning the files. I want to know whether you spoke to him concerning what happened here?

A General von Rundstedt explained to us what happened here.

Q He made a speech to you concerning that, isn't that correct?

A No.

Q He only told you?

A Yes.

Q Who else was there? There was somebody else there, who was that? You know exactly what I mean. There were some others present. Who were they?

H0979-0009

A Field Marshal List.

Q Who else?

A General Westphal.

Q Am I correct in saying that General Westphal also told you about his experiences up here?

A Yes, he also explained how it was up here.

Q He discussed all questions and answers with you, is that correct?

A What questions and answers do you mean?

Q Which I asked.

A Yes, some questions.

Q General von Leeb also talked to you about it. Am I correct?

A Yes.

Q He also told you that Mr. Kempner asked certain questions up here, is that correct?

A Yes, that he did ask certain questions.

Q He also gave you the answers that he gave here?

A Yes, some of the answers.

Q I want now to go over to another matter. When you were Commander-in-Chief of the Armored Force in the East....

DR. LATERNSER: Commissioner, I would like you to decide whether or not, after direct examination, the cross-examination and the re-direct examination, the Prosecution is allowed to ask any more questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The Prosecution is allowed to cover new matters that were brought out in re-direct examination in this connection and anything which bears on the credibility of the witness and his answers is always relevant. If the witness has spoken to other witnesses and found out their answers, that certainly is very relevant.

8

H0979 - 0010

BY DR. KEMPNER:

Q This is a very short chapter I want to take up. How often did conferences occur between ~~x~~ the staff of your army and the staff of the neighboring armies?

A We commanders-in-chief of the armies were at times called back to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army Group for discussions. In general, that was not very often since the Commander-in-Chief of the Army Group visited us frequently.

Q I asked you how often men of your staff talked with men of the staffs of the neighboring armies -- weekly or monthly?

A Meetings almost never and if they did talk together then it was by telephone.

Q How often did they have telephone conversations with the men of the neighboring armies -- every morning or every other morning?

A There was a constant telephone connection, with the exception of short intervals when they were disrupted by enemy action.

DR. KEMPNER: That is all.

DR. LATERNSER: I am sorry but I also have to ask a few more questions in connection with these questions here.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Well this can't go on forever, Dr. Laternser. This is your witness and the other party is allowed to have cross-examination.

DR. LATERNSER: I was already finished but through the questioning of the Prosecution new questions arose.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You may ask the questions.

~~RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)~~

H0979-0011

DR. LATERNSER: Witness, where are you living at present?

WITNESS: Over there in the prison.

DR. LATERNSER: Are there other generals in that prison?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. LATERNSER: Can you meet each other?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Is the point of this the question of whether he discussed this matter with other generals or not?

DR. LATERNSER: I want to bring out with this questioning, in relation to the previous questioning, that the witnesses are together over there, they have the possibility of speaking together, and of course will exchange information when they are able to.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: But what is the relevancy?

DR. LATERNSER: The reason for this questioning is because it seems evident that the Prosecution regards this discussion among the witnesses with a great importance.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: All the Prosecution has done, Dr. Laternser, is show that matters which have come up here have been discussed with at least two other witnesses who have appeared before the Commission before this witness appeared before it, and inbetween times, when he appeared and went back to the cell and when he came in the next morning. I do not see that they have gone any further. I don't see what you can further develop and I don't see what implications or inferences you can draw from it.

DR. LATERNSER: I have one last question. Witness, who gave you the files which you studied, that is, I mean the files we were talking about in previous questions?

10

H0979 - 0012

WITNESS: I was sent these files by you.

DR. LATERNSER: I have no further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You testified that it was impossible to make preparations to take care of the huge number of prisoners of war that were captured in the Russian Campaign.

WITNESS: Yes, that is sufficient preparations.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Were any preparations made at all?

WITNESS: Yes, as far as we within the Army had to feed and take care of the prisoners we prepared for it or took care of it. We named leadership groups for these prisoners and also we prepared any food that these prisoners were to receive after being captured. And then we handed these prisoners over to the rear as fast as possible.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What attempts were made by you to get food for these prisoners:

WITNESS: We received from the army stocks the food for the prisoners.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did you request more food for the prisoners?

WITNESS: At times we fed them from our own stocks and especially during the battle of Wrasma, to which you might be referring, we did not receive any supplies from our rear because of transport. We attempted to receive more stocks and more material from the land we were in right then.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Didn't you anticipate that you would have huge numbers of prisoners of war to take care of?

WITNESS: No, we didn't expect such large numbers. During the Battle of Wrasma we took several hundred thousand within a few days. At that time I was commander-in-chief of an armored group.

H0979 - 0013

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Under whose command was Kaminsky?

WITNESS: I didn't understand the question.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You said there was a Russian Brigade which was responsible for the atrocities at Warsaw, at least a German Brigade, composed of Russian soldiers who were responsible for the atrocities at Warsaw.

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Who was the commander of that Brigade?

WITNESS: Kaminsky, a Russian.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Under whose command was he?

WITNESS: That was an SS Brigade, under the direct command of General von dem Bach.

Kaminsky

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did you have any control over this general?

WITNESS: No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You said that you wanted Germany to get its colonies back.

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Were there other generals of the same opinion?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Would you say it was a general attitude of the General Staff ~~to hold that opinion~~?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did the General Staff anticipate that it would be possible to obtain these colonies back by negotiation?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: And if they couldn't be obtained by negotiation, ~~what then?~~

COM. A.
Take 1 - 13
LESSER
25 June
Rhinehardt

H0979 - 0014

~~CAPTAIN TUBRIDY~~ xT

WITNESS: Then we never would have received them.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: That is all. The witness may retire.

(The Commission adjourned at 1045 hours.)

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of HANS RHINEHARDT, taken on 25 June 1946.

Mabel A Lesser
Reporter (pp.)

CERTIFIED TO:

Joseph F Tubridy
Commissioner

13

H0979-0015

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 of the ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

25 June 1946

COMMISSIONER:

CAPTAIN JOSEPH TUBRIDY

THE O. K. W.

(THE COMMISSION CONVENED AT 1000 HOURS)

GENERAL HANS RHINEHARDT, a witness took the stand and testified as follows:

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY DR. LATERNSER:

Q Witness, I want to ask you one more question concerning the affidavit No. 14 which was presented yesterday by the Prosecution, an affidavit signed by the General of the Police, von dem Bach-Zelewski. I quote from the top of page 3. He says: "It is without a question that both the Army formations and the formations of the SS and Police went far over their goal with these counter measures. In the general discussions which Schenkendorff carried out, this fact was found to be true time and time again." I would like you to tell me what you did or what you ordered if you found out that in anti-partisan warfare some of your troops went over the ordered measures or beyond the ordered measures.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Excuse me a minute. I would like to hear again what was quoted from the affidavit.

(Court reporter read the quotation from the affidavit.)

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: All right.

A When soldiers were responsible for measures that were not ordered during these anti-partisan activities, then I had them disciplined severely. I do not know what happened in the areas of General Schenckendorff or General von dem Bach.

Q Can you give us a special example as to how you acted against any kind of excessive measures by your troops against the partisans?

HO979 - 0016

A I do not remember any specific examples from memory but the Court Martial records of the army could tell you about them.

Q On page 4 of the affidavit No. 14, General von dem Bach-Zelewski states as follows, and I quote: "During the fall of 1943 virtually the entire border between the Army Group North and Army Group Center was occupied by a strongly led partisan unit. On my partisan map I designated this area as a partisan republic. Both the Army leader of the Vitebsk Area, that is, General Rhinehardt, as well as I, reported these dangers in memoranda. These memoranda were exchanged between the Commando Staff Reichsfuehrer SS and the OKH." General, I want to ask you whether you too sent a memorandum to the Reichsfuehrer SS?

A Without a doubt you are speaking here of the partisan area south of Polotzk, which I already talked about. I pointed out the dangers of this partisan groups several times in memoranda to higher headquarters and asked for reserves in order to combat these men. However, my memoranda went only to General Field Marshal von Kluge, my superior officer. I never reported it to the Reichsfuehrer SS.

Q The Prosecution also presented yesterday Affidavit No. 24, USA 565 of Colonel Rolin, and I quote from this statement: "I was at the beginning of the war, First General Staff Officer of the 17th Armored Division." I skip a few sentences wherein the person who wrote this affidavit, that is, Colonel Rolin, talks about the Commissar Order, and now I quote again: "This Decree was for all formations of the Eastern Armies." I would like to ask you now, according to your military knowledge, whether a First General Staff Officer of an Armored Division can give this kind of far-reaching information, that is, information that the Commissar Decree was meant for all formations of the Eastern Armies?

A In itself, a First General Staff Officer of a Division cannot judge a matter like that. However, it is possible that the distribution on this Decree was marked to all formations or all units.

Q In other words, he could have seen from the distribution that this Decree was being distributed and where it was being distributed. Did he, as First General Staff Officer of a Division, have the possibility to see whether or not this order was carried out on the entire front?

H0979 -0017

A. No, he did not have that possibility and the best proof of this is that the Decree was not passed on to all army formations and therefore he did judge wrong.

Q. Was a division on the front informed of the position of the neighboring divisions?

A. No, just the opposite. We only found out what was absolutely necessary for our district, on order of the Fuehrer himself, in order to keep it secret.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean you did now know what divisions were on your right and on your left?

WITNESS: That we knew but we did not know their intentions or their duties.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean you did not know the plans of the divisions on the right and left?

WITNESS: I knew the plans of my division, yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: But you did not know the plans of the divisions on your right and left?

WITNESS: No, I was not informed in detail ofthe plans of the neighboring divisions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You were not asked whether you wereinformed in detail. You were asked whether you knew?

WITNESS: Not always.

DR. LATERNSER: I would ask for orientation concerning the knowwledge of one division about the plans and intentions of neighboring divisions from the standpoint of the one division.

WITNESS: The division did not have any information concerning this.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I think the witness is testifying to general affairs. The general question is whether a General Staff Officer of one division would know the plans and operations of divisions on either side. If the witness is testifying to a general practice he should not be talking about his own division.

DR. LATERNSER: I am finished with the questioning on this chapter.

H0979 - 0018

BY DR. LATERNSER:

Q You answered yesterday, to a question of Dr. Kempner, that you were put in charge of the provisional staff that was to prepare for a landing in England. What did this staff think of the possibilities of a landing like that?

A The action was, in our eyes, extremely difficult. I considered the possibility of success as being very small.

Q Did you let your superiors know of your opinion?

A This opinion of mine was stated to General von Brauchistch in detail during an inspection of his at Antwerp.

Q And what was his point of view?

A He agreed with my opinion.

Q Yesterday, during our cross examination, you were questioned concerning the order that General von Reichenau had issued to his troops concerning treatment of civilian population. Did you receive that order?

A Yes, I received that order.

Q Did you passit on?

A No, I did not pass it on.

Q Was your relation to the civilian population changed after receiving this order?

A No.

Q Yesterday there was also talk concerning the orders, according to which no prisoners were to be taken in the East. Can you remember that you ever received any such Decree or Directive?

A No.

Q When and where did you hear concerning these directives?

A I only heard of them here in Nurnberg, while studying the files.

Q In the sector whichwas under your command as Commander-in-Chief, was anyaction taken according to an order like that?

A No.

Q In your territory were many prisoners taken?

A We took a great many prisoners.

Q Yesterday you were also shown a letter, by Rosenberg, dated 28 February 1942, in which it stated that half-starving Russians prisoners were being shot. Do you know of any orders or decrees which were given out

H0979 - 0019

by any office at any time, according to which half starved prisoners were to be shot?

A No.

Q Did you, during your advance, find reasons to believe that the enemies were shooting German prisoners?

A Several times.

Q You were also asked by the Russian Prosecutor, General Pokrovsky, about an order, according to which the Germans, during the winter of 1941, took the felt shoes from the Russian prisoners of war. You stated to the questioning of Colonel Pokrovsky that you considered this order a military necessity. Forwhat reason?

A This is an order which lower commanders gave. We took the felt shoes away in order to guard our own men against frost-bite because we had a large number of casualities through freezing. We had to keep our soldiers able to fight.

Q Did these Russian soldiers have other shoes besides the felt shoes that you took away from them?

A First of all, the Russian soldiers had another pair of shoes with them and in addition to that they received the shoes which our soldiers took off.

DR. FELCKMANN: I have no further questions.

DR. KEMPNER: I would like to be allowed to ask about a few things which came up right now.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

BY DR. KEMPNER:

Q You stated here that you studied the files. What files did you study?

A The files of the prosecution.

Q What did they contain - what were they?

A The indictments of the various prosecutors and the files that were connected with them.

Q With whom did you study them?

A I read them by myself.

H0979 - 0020

Q. With whom did you speak concerning this entire complex within the last three or four weeks. I do not mean Dr. Laternser.

A. With some Generals with whom I am living over there.

Q. Von Rundstedt?

A. Not in detail, with General von Rundstedt.

Q. But in general?

A. No, I hardly spoke with General von Rundstedt concerning this question.

Q. What do you mean by "hardly"?

A. I did not speak to General von Rundstedt at allconcerning this question.

Q. Within the last two minutes you have made three different statements - you "hardly" spoke with him about it, you "did not speak at all" with him about it and you said something else. Now what am I supposed to believe?

A. I did not speak with General von Rundstedt concerning the individual single indictment files.

Q. Did you speak to him after he was questioned here?

A. Not concerning these files.

Q. You know very well that I do not mean concerning the files. I want to know whether you spoke to him concerning what happened here?

A. General von Rundstedt explained to us what happened here.

Q. He made a speech to you concerning that, isn't that correct?

A. No.

Q. He only told you?

A. Yes.

Q. Who else was there? There wassomebody else there, who was that? You know exactly what I mean. There were some others present. Who were they?

H0979-0021

A. Field Marshal List.

Q. Who else ?

A. General Westphal

Q. Am I correct in saying that General Westphal also told you about his experiences up here ?

A. Yes, he also explained how it was up here.

Q. He discussed all questions and answers with you, is that correct ?

A. What questions and answers do you mean ?

Q. Whic I asked.

A. Yes, some questions.

Q. General von Leeb also talked to you about it. Am I correct ?

A. Yes.

Q. He also told you that Mr. Kempner asked certain questions up here, is that correct ?

A. Yes, that he did ask certain questions.

Q. He also gave you the answers that he gave here ?

A. Yes, some of the answers that he gave here.

Q. I want now to go over to another matter. When you were Commander-in-Chief of the Armored Force in the East ....

DR. LATERNSER: Commissioner, I would like you to decide whether or not, after direct examination, the cross-examination and the re-direct examination, the Prosecution is allowed to ask any more questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The Prosecution is allowed to cover new matters that were brought out in re-direct examination in this connection anything which bears on the credibility of the witness and his answers is always relevant. If the witness has spoken to ther witnesses and found out their answers, that certainly is very relevant.

BY DR. KEMPNER:

Q. This is a very short chapter I want to take up. How often did conferences occur between the staff of your army and the staff of the neighboring armies ?

A. We commanders-in-Chief of the armies were at times called back to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army Group for discussions. In general that was not very often since the Commander-in-Chief of the Army Group visited us frequently

H0979 - 0022

Q. I asked you how often men of your staff talked with men of the staffs of the neighboring armies -- weekly or monthly ?

A. Meetings almost never and if they did talk together then it was by telephone.

Q. How often did they have telephone conversations with the men of the neighboring armies -- every morning or every other morning ?

A. There was a constant telephone connection, with the exception of short intervals when they were disrupted by enemy action.

DR. KEMPNER: That is all.

DR. LATERNSER: I am sorry but I also have to ask a few more questions in connection with these questions here.

CAPTAIN TUBIRDY: You may ask the questions.

DR. LATERNSER: Witness, where are you living at present ?

WITNESS: Over there in the prison.

DR. LATERNSER: Are there other generals in that prison ?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. LATERNSER: Can you meet each other ?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Is the point of this the question of whether he discussed this matter with other generals or not ?

DR. LATERNSER : I want to bring out with this questioning, in relation to the previous questioning, that the witnesses are together over there, they have the possiblity of speaking to ether, and of course will exchange information when they are able to.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: But what is the relevancy ?

DR. LATERNSER: The reason for this questioning is because it seems evident that the Prosecution regards this discussion among the witnesses with a great importance.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: All the Prosecution has done, Dr. Laternser, is show that matters which have come up here have been discussed with at least two other witnesses who have appeared before the Commission before this witness appeared before it, and inbetween times, when he appeared and went back to the call and when he came in the next morning. I do not see that they have gone any further. I don't see what you can further develop and I don't see what furthe. implications or inferences can be draw from it.

DR. LATERNSER: I have one last question. Witness, who gave you the file which you studied, that is, I mean the files we were talking about in previous questions ?

WITNESS: I was sent these files by you.

DR. LATERNSER: I have no further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You testified that it was impossible to make preparations to take care of the huge number of prisoners of war that were captured in the Russian campaign.

WITNESS: Yes, that is sufficient preparations.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Were any preparations made at all ?

WITNESS: Yes, as far as we within the Army had to feed and take care of the prisoners we prepared for it or took care of it. We named leadership groups for these prisoners and also we prepared any food that these prisoners were to receive after being captured. And then we handed these prisoners over to the rear as fast as possible.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What attempts were made by you to get food for these prisoners :

WITNESS: We received from the army stocks the food for the prisoners.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did you request more food for the prisoners ?

WITNESS: At times we fed them from our own stocks and especially during the battle of Wrasma, to which you might be referring, we did not receive any supplies from our rear because of transport. We attempted to receive more stocks and more material from the land we were in right then.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Didn't you anticipate that you would have huge numbers of prisoners of war to take care of ?

WITNESS: No , we didn't expect such large numbers. During the Battle of Wrasma we took several hundred thousand within a few days. At that time I was commander-in-chief of an armored group.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Under whose command was Kaminsky ?

WITNESS: I didn't understand the question.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You said there was a Russian Brigade which was responsible for the atrocities at Warsaw, at least a German Brigade, composed of Russian soldiers who were responsible for the atrocities at Warsaw.

WITNESS: Yes

H0979-0023

H0979 - 0024

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Who was the commander of that Brigade ?

WITNESS: Kaminsky, a Russian.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Under whose command was he ?

WITNESS: That was an SS Brigade, under the direct command of General von den Bach.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did you have any control over this general Kaminsky ?

WITNESS: No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You said that you wanted Germany to get its colonies back.

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Would you say it was a general attitude of the General staff ?

WITNESS: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Did the General Staff anticipate that it would be possible to obtain these colonies back by negotiations ?

WITNESS. Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: And if they couldn't be obtained by negotiation ?

WITNESS: Then we never would have received them.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: That is all. The witness may retire.

(The commission adjourned at 1045 hours).

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of HANS RHINEHARDT, taken on 25 June 1946.

Mabel A. Lesser
reporter

CERTIFIED TO :

Joseph F. Tubridy
commissioner

H0979 - 0025

Amtliche Niederschrift der Zeugenaussagen über angeklagte Organisationen vor der vom Internationalen Militärgerichtshof am 13. März 1946 gemäss Paragraph 4 ernannten Kommission.

Dienstag, 25. Juni 1946

Beauftragter: Capt. TUBRIDY

Organisation: Generalstab

Verteidiger: Dr. Laternser.

Weitere Vernehmung (Wiederverhör)

des Zeugen Generaloberst R e i n h a r d t .

DURCH DR. LATERNSER:

F: Herr Zeuge, ich habe noch eine Frage zu dem Affidavit Nr. 14, dass die Anklagebehörde gestern vorgelegt hat und das von dem Zeugen General der Polizei von dem Bach-Zelewski abgegeben worden ist. Zelewski gibt auf Seite 3 folgendes an: "Es ist ohne Frage gleichermassen von Wehrmachtformationen als auch SS- und Polizeiverbänden bei Gegenmassnahmen weit über das Ziel geschossen worden. Bei einer Generalbesprechung, die Schenckendorff abhielt, ist diese Tatsache festgestellt worden." Ich möchte Sie nun fragen, was von Ihrer Seite aus veranlasst worden ist, wenn Sie Meldungen erhielten, dass die Truppe bei Bandenkämpfen Exzesse begangen hatte?

A: Wenn Soldaten bei Bandenunternehmen sich Übergriffe zu Schulden kommen liessen, habe ich eingegriffen mit den schärfsten Strafen. Über das, was sich in dem Gebiet von General Schenckendorf und General der Polizei von dem Bach zugetragen hatte, weiss ich nichts.

F: Können Sie ein besonders markantes Beispiel dafür angeben, dass Sie gegen einen Exzess, begangen von eigenen Soldaten, besonders scharf eingegriffen haben?

A: Besondere Beispiele kann ich nicht mehr anführen aus der Erinnerung. Dafür müssten aber die Gerichtsakten der Armee sprechen.

F: Auf Seite 4 des Affidavits Nr. 14 gibt General von dem Bach-Zelewski folgendes an. Ich zitiere: "Im Herbst 1943 war fast das ganze Gebiet an der Nahtstelle der beiden Heeresgruppen Nord und

H0979 - 0026

Mitte von einer straffgeführten Partisanengruppe besetzt. Auf meiner Partisanen-Lagekarte bezeichnete ich dieses Gebiet als Partisanenrepuplik. Sowohl der zuständige Armeeführer in Witebsk (Generaloberst Reinhardt) als auch ich machten in Denkschriften auf diese Gefahr aufmerksam. Diese Denkschriften wurden zwischen dem Kommandostab Reichsführer SS und dem OKH ausgetauscht." Ende des Zitates.

Herr Generaloberst, ich möchte Sie fragen, ob Sie eine etwa verfasste Denkschrift auch an den Reichsführer SS gegeben haben?

A: Es handelt sich offensichtlich um das grosse Bandengebiet südlich Polotzk, das ich schon erwähnt habe in meiner Aussage. Die grosse Gefahr, die darin lag, habe ich mehrfach in Denkschriften nach oben gemeldet und um Reserven gebeten zur Bekämpfung dieser Banden. Meine Denkschriften sind an den Generalfeldmarschall von Kluge, meinen Vorgesetzten, gegangen. An den Reichsführer SS habe ich niemals berichtet darüber.

F: Die Anklage hat gestern weiter das Affidavit Nr. 24 des Obersten von Bonin USA 565, vorgelegt. Ich zitiere aus dieser eidesstattlichen Erklärung: "Ich war zu Beginn des russischen Feldzuges erster Generalstabsoffizier der 17. Panzerdivision." Ich lasse nun einige Sätze aus. Der Aussteller, Oberst von Bonin, gibt dann hinsichtlich des Kommissar-Befehls an und ich zitiere: "Dieser Befehl galt für alle Einheiten des Ostheeres." Ende des Zitates.
Ich wollte Sie nun fragen, auf Grund Ihrer militärischen Kenntnisse, ob ein Generalstabsoffizier einer Panzerdivision einen derartigen Überblick über eine so weit ausgedehnte Front, wie die Ostfront, hatte, dass er angeben kann, dass dieser Befehl für alle Einheiten des Ostheeres gegolten hat?

A: An sich kann der erste Generalstabsoffizier einer Division diese Frage nicht beurteilen. Es kann aber sein, dass auf diesem Befehl der Verteiler vorgeschrieben war: "An alle Truppen bekanntzugeben."

F: Er hätte also aus dem Verteiler ersehen können, wenn er auf dem Befehl gestanden hat, dass dieser Befehl zur Verteilung gelangt ist? Hatte er als Generalstabsoffizier einer Division die Möglich-

H0979 – 0027

keit zu übersehen, dass dieser Befehl an der ganzen Front durchgeführt worden ist?

A: Diese Möglichkeit hatte er nicht, und es beweist die Tatsache, dass der Befehl nicht an alle Stellen weitergegeben worden ist, dass er falsch geurteilt hat.

F: Ist überhaupt die Truppe einer Division an einer Front orientiert worden über die Lage der Nachbar-Division?

A: Nein, im Gegenteil. Wir haben alle nur das Notwendigste erfahren, was für unseren Bereich galt, auf den ausdrücklichen Führerbefehl hin wegen Geheimhaltung.

DURCH CAPT.TUBRIDY:

F: Wollen Sie damit sagen, dass Sie nicht einmal gewusst haben, was für Divisionen links und rechts von Ihnen waren?

A: Das haben wir gewusst, aber nicht, was drüben für Absichten oder Aufträge vorlagen.

F: Wollen Sie damit sagen, dass Sie noch nicht einmal die Pläne der Divisionen rechts und links gewusst haben?

A: Meiner Division wohl.

F: Und Sie wussten nicht die Pläne der Divisionen rechts und links von Ihnen?

A: Über die Nachbarpläne bin ich nicht im Einzelnen orientiert worden.

F: Ich habe Sie nicht gefragt, ob Sie die Pläne genau erfahren haben, ich habe nur gefragt, ob Sie die Pläne erfahren haben.

A: Nicht immer.

DR.LATERNSER: Ich hatte die Frage über die Orientierung einer Division und über die Absichten oder Aufträge für die Nachbar-Divisionen gestellt und zwar vom Standpunkt dieser Kommission aus.

A: Die Division wusste darüber nicht Bescheid.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Ich glaubte, der Zeuge werde über allgemeine Fragen sprechen, die mit dem OKW zusammenhängen. Er gibt aber nur Antworten über einzelne Divisionen und ihre Nachbarpläne. Wenn der Zeuge über Allgemeinheiten sprechen will oder soll, dann soll er nicht von seiner eigenen Division sprechen.

H0979 - 0028

DURCH DR.LATERNSER:

F: Ich bin mit dieser Befragung sowieso zu Ende. Sie haben gestern, auf Befragen durch Dr. Kempner angegeben, dass Sie einen Versuchstab geführt haben, der eingesetzt worden war zur Vorbereitung einer Landung in England. Wie beurteilte dieser Stab die Aussichten für ein derartiges Unternehmen?

A: Das Unternehmen war in unseren Augen ausserordentlich schwierig. Die Aussichten des Gelingens beurteilte ich als sehr gering.

F: Haben Sie diesen Standpunkt auch Ihren Vorgesetzten vorgetragen?

A: Dieser Standpunkt ist von mir dem Generalfeldmarschall von Brauchitsch bei einem Besuch in Antwerpen eindeutig zur Sprache gebracht worden.

F: Und wie war dessen Standpunkt?

A: Aucher erkannte die Bedenken durchaus an.

F: Es wurde Ihnen gestern im Kreuzverhör der Befehl vorgehalten, den General von Reichenau über die Behandlung der Bevölkerung in dem besetzten Ostgebiet herausgegeben hat. Haben Sie diesen Befehl bekommen?

A: Den Befehl habe ich bekommen.

F: Haben Sie ihn weitergegeben?

A: Nein, ich habe ihn nicht weitergegeben.

F: Hat sich nach Erhalt dieses Befehls Ihre Einstellung gegenüber der Zivilbevölkerung geändert?

A: Nein.

F: Es wurde gestern weiter im Kreuzverhör von Befehlen gesprochen, dass im Osten keine Gefangenen zu machen seien. Können Sie sich erinnern, jemals einen derartigen Befehl erhalten zu haben?

A: Nein.

F: Wann haben Sie und wo haben Sie von derartigen Befehlen gehört?

A: Von diesen Befehlen habe ich hier erst in Nürnberg beim Studium der Akten gehört.

F: Ist in Ihrem Bereich, der Ihnen als Oberbefehlshaber unter-

H0979 – 0029

stand, entsprechend solchen Befehlen irgendwie gehandelt worden?

A: Nein.

F: Sind gerade in Ihrem Bereich viele Gefangene gemacht worden?

A: Wir haben sehr viel Gefangene gemacht.

F: Es wurde Ihnen weiter ein Brief von Rosenberg vom 28. Febr. 1942 vorgehalten, in dem berichtet worden ist, dass halbverhungerte russische Gefangene erschossen worden seien. Wissen Sie etwas darüber, dass derartige Befehle mit diesem Ziel, halbverhungerte Gefangene zu erschiessen, jemals von irgendeiner Stelle herausgegeben worden sind?

A: Nein.

F: Haben Sie beim Vorgehen Feststellungen in der Richtung gemacht, dass auch von der Gegenseite deutsche Gefangene erschossen worden sind?

A: Mehrfach.

F: Sie sind dann weiter befragt worden durch den russischen Ankläger, Herrn Oberst Pokrowski, über einen Befehl oder eine Anordnung, nach der im Winter 1941 den russischen Gefangenen Filzstiefel die sie trugen, abgenommen werden sollen. Sie sagten auf die Frage des Herrn Obersten Pokrowsky, dass Sie diesen als militärisch gerechtfertigt erachteten. Aus welchen Gründen?

A: Es handelte sich um einen Befehl, den untere Kommandeure gegeben haben. Die Abnahme der Filzstiefel ist erfolgt, um unsere Soldaten gegen den grossen Frost zu schützen. Denn wir haben grosse Ausfälle durch Erfrierungen gehabt und mussten unsere Soldaten kampffähig erhalten mit allen Mitteln.

F: Haben die sowjetrussischen Soldaten ausser diesen Filzstiefeln weitere Stiefel gehabt?

A: Erstens hatten die Russen bei sich noch ein Paar andere Schuhe und ausserdem erhielten sie dafür die Schuhe und Stiefel, die unsere Soldaten auszogen.

DR.LATERNSER: Ich habe keine weitere Frage mehr.

H0979 – 0030

K r e u z v e r h ö r !

DURCH DR. KEMPNER:

F: Erlauben Sie mir, dass ich noch 2 Fragen stelle. Sie haben gesagt, dass Sie hier die Akten studiert habem. Welche Akten haben Sie studiert?

A: Die Anklageakten.

F: Was war das, woraus bestand das?

A: Die Anklage der verschiedenen Ankläger mit dem dabei liegender Aktenmaterial.

F: Mit wem haben Sie das zusammen studiert hier unten?

A: Das habe ich für mich gelesen.

F: Mit welchen Herren haben Sie darüber gesprochen, über den ganzen Komplex während der letzten 3, 4 Wochen? Ich meine nicht Herrn Dr. Laternser selbstverständlich.

A: Mit einzelnen Generalen, mit denen ich drüben untergebracht bin.

F: Mit Herrn von Rundstedt?

A: Mit Herrn von Rundstedt im Einzelnen nicht.

F: Aber im allgemeinen?

A: Nein, mit Feldmarschall von Rundstedt habe ich kaum über diese Frage gesprochen.

F: Was heisst kaum? Was heisst das Wort kaum?

A: Mit Feldmarschall von Rundstedt habe ich über diese Frage überhaupt nicht gesprochen?

F: Sie haben in der letzten Minute 3 verschiedene Aussagen gemacht: Sie haben kaum mit ihm gesprochen, Sie haben überhaupt nicht mit ihm gesprochen, und noch etwas anderes. Was soll ich glauben?

A: Mit Feldmarschall von Rundstedt habe ich über diese Frage der einzelnen Anklageakten nicht gesprochen.

F: Haben Sie mit ihm gesprochen, nachdem er hier vernommen worden war?

A: Über diese Akten nicht.

F: Sie wissen genau, dass ich nicht über die Akten frage. Über das, was hier vorgegangen ist, haben Sie darüber gesprochen?

H0979 - 0031

A: Der Feldmarschall von Rundstedt hat uns erzählt, wie es hier gewesen ist.

F: Er hat Ihnen einen genauen Vortrag gehalten? Ist das richtig?

A: Nein.

F: Er hat Ihnen nur erzählt?

A: Ja.

F: Wer war noch dabei? Es war noch jemand dabei. Wer war das? Wer war dabei? Wie Feldmarschall von Rundstedt über diese Frage erzählt hat?

A: Feldmarschall vonnManstein.

F: Weiter. Sie wissen es ganz genau. Sie können sich ein bisschen beeilen.

A: Feldmarschall List.

F: Weiter.

A: Der General Westphal.

F: General Westphal hat Ihnen auch über seine Erfahrungen hier unten erzählt? Ist das richtig?

A: Er hat auch erzählt, wie es hier zugegangen ist.

F: Er hat alle Fragen und Antworten mit Ihnen erörtert. Ist das richtig?

A: Welche Fragen und Antworten sind gemeint?

F: Die ich gestellt habe.

A: Einzelne Fragen, jawohl.

F: Herr von Leeb hat auch mit Ihnen darüber gesprochen. Ist das richtig?

A: Ja.

F: Er hat Ihnen auch erzählt, dass Dr. Kempner hier bestimmte Fragen stellen würde. Ist das richtig?

A: Dass er hier bestimmte Fragen gestellt hat, ja.

F: Er hat Ihnen auch die Antworten erzählt, die er gegeben hat. Ist das richtig?

A: Einzelne Antworten, ja.

F: Dann kurz etwas anderes: Als Sie den Oberbefehl über die Panzer hatten, haben Sie....

H0979 - 0032

DR.LATERNSER: Herr Präsident, ich möchte die Frage geprüft wissen, ob der Herr Anklagevertreter nach Durchführung des Kreuzverhörs und meines Rückverhörs nunmehr noch berechtigt ist, Fragen an den Zeugen zu richten.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Die Anklage kann Fragen über neue Sachen stellen, die sie in ihrem zweiten Verhör aufgestellt haben, und in diesem Zusammenhang ist alles das, was sich darauf bezieht, ob der Zeuge richtige Aussagen macht, auch erheblich. Und es ist wirklich sehr erheblich, wenn der Zeuge mit anderen Leuten gesprochen hat, die h hier auch Aussagen gemacht haben.

DR.KEMPNER: Der Abschnitt wird ganz kurz sein, den ich hier berühren werde.

DURCH DR.KEMPNER:

F: Wie oft haben Konferenzen stattgefunden zwischen den Herren Ihres Stabes und den Herren der Nachbararmeen?

A: Wir Oberbefehlshaber sind in verschiedenen Zeiträumen zu unserem Oberbefehlshaber der Heeresgruppe zu Besprechungen zusammengerufen worden. Im allgemeinen selten, weil der Oberbefehlshaber der Heeresgruppe uns mehrfach oder mehr selbst besucht hat.

F: Ich habe gefragt, wie oft Herren Ihres Stabes mit dem Herren der Stäbe der Nachbarmeen gesprochen haben, wöchentlich oder monatlich?

A: Zusammenkünfte fast nie. Wenn sie gesprochen haben, dann telefonisch.

F: Wie oft haben Sie mit Ihren Nachbararmeen telefonische Verbindung gehabt, jeden Morgen oder jeden zweiten Morgen?

A: Telefonische Verbindung hat immer bestanden mit Ausnahme der kurzen Unterbrechungen durch Zerstörung.

DR.KEMPNER: Das ist alles.

DR.LATERNSER: Ich bedauere, ich muss auch noch einige Fragen im Anschluss an diese Fragen stellen.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Sie können Ihre Fragen stellen.

DURCH DR.LATERNSER:

F: Wo befinden Sie sich zur Zeit?

H0979 - 0033

A: Drüben im Gefängnis.

F: Befinden sich im Gefängnis noch andere Generale?

A: Ja.

F: Können Sie miteinander verkehren?

A: Ja.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Wollen Sie mit dieser Fragestellung klären, ob er mit anderen Generalen gesprochen hat?

DR.LATERNSER: Nein. Ich will nur mit dieser Befragung die Verhältnisse feststellen, aus denen sich ergibt, dass selbstverständlich die Zeugen miteinander sprechen, wenn sie dazu in der Lage sind.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: In welcher Weise ist dies erheblich?

DR.LATERNSER: Weil durch die Befragung des Anklägers gewissen Punkten der Besprechung unter den Zeugen anscheinend eine besondere Bedeutung beigemessen werden soll.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Ich weiss nur,dass die Anklage durch diese Fragen herausgebracht hat, dass der Zeuge sich mit zwei anderen Zeugen, die schon vor dieser Kommission vernommen worden sind, unterhalten hat über die Fragen und Antworten vor dieser Kommission. Was Sie sonst weiter durch Ihre Befragung beweisen und prüfen wollen,kann ich nicht ersehen.

DR.LATERNSER: Ich habe nur noch eine letzte Frage.

DURCH DR.LATERNSER:

F: Von wem sind Ihnen die Akten zur Verfügung gestellt worden, auf die Sie in der Aussage Bezug genommen haben?

A: Diese Akten sind mir von Ihnen zugeschickt worden.

DR.LATERNSER: Jawohl, ich habe keine weiteren Fragen mehr.

DURCH CAPT.TUBRIDY:

F: Sie haben ausgesagt, dass es unmöglich gewesen sei, Vorbereitungen zu treffen für die grosse Anzahl von Gefangenen, die Sie gemacht haben?

A: Ja, ausreichende Vorbereitungen.

F: Wurden irgendwelche Vorbereitungen getroffen?

A: Soweit wir innernhalb der Armee Gefangene zu versorgen und

H0979 – 0034

abzuschieben hatten, haben wir bei uns dafür gesorgt. Wir haben Führungs-Kommandos bestimmt und ebenso die Versorgung der Gefangene; soweit sie in unserem Bereich waren, besorgt, und dann die Gefangenen möglichst schnell nach rückwärts abgegeben.

F: Welche Vorbereitungen wurden von Ihnen getroffen, um Nahrungsmittel für diese Gefangenen zu erhalten?

A: Aus den Beständen der Armee wurde die Verpflegung für die Gefangenen zugeschossen.

F: Haben Sie mehr Nahrungsmittel für die Gefangenen verlangt?

A: Wir haben aus unseren Beständen gegeben. Wir sind von rückwärts teilweise in dieser Schlacht von Jasma, auf die es besonders ankommt, nicht versorgt worden, weil der Nachschub nicht ging, und wir haben versucht, aus dem Land Vorräte noch dazu zu bekommen.

F: Haben Sie nicht erwartet, dass Sie eine enorme Anzahl von Kriegsgefangenen haben werden?

A: Eine solch grosse Zahl haben wir nicht erwartet. Es handelte sich in der Schlacht von Jasma um mehrere Hunderttausende in wenigen Tagen. Zu dieser Zeit war ich kommandierender General eines Panzerkorps.

F: Unter wessen Befehl stand Kaminski?

A: Ich habe nicht verstanden.

F: Sie sagten, dass eine russische Brigade für die Greueltaten, das heisst eine deutsche Brigade mit russischen Soldaten in Warschau verantwortlich war?

A: Ja.

F: Wer war der Kommandant dieser Brigade?

A: Kaminski, ein Russe.

F: Unter wessen Befehl stand er?

A: Das war eine SS-Brigade unter dem unmittelbaren Befehl von General von dem Bach.

F: Hatten Sie irgendwelche Befehlsgewalt über diesen General?

A: Nein.

F: Sie haben ausgesagt, dass Sie wollten, dass Deutschland seine Kolonien zurückerhält?

H0979 - 0035

A: Ja.

F: Hat es andere Generale gegeben, die derselben Meinung waren?

A: Ja.

F: Würden Sie sagen, dass dies die allgemeine Meinung des Generalstabes war?

A: Ja.

F: Hatte der Generalstab gedacht, dass diese Kolonien durch Diskussionen und Verhandlungen zurückerhalten werden könnten?

A: Ja.

F: Und wenn Sie nicht durch friedliche Verhandlungen zurückerhalten werden konnten, was dann?

A: Dann hätten wir sie nie bekommen.

CAPT.TUBRIDY: Das ist alles.

(Damit war die Vernehmung des Zeugen Generaloberst Reinhardt beendet).

Das Vorstehende ist eine wahre und richtige Niederschrift der Aussagen vom 25.Juni 1946.

Unterschrieben: Rudolf Wahl
Gerichtsstenograph

Beglaubigt: Captain Joseph F. Tubridy
Beauftragter.